

*Application No. 10/772489
Page 6*

*Amendment
Attorney Docket No. P68.2B-11477-US01*

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated December 17, 2004. Each issue in the official action is discussed below.

IDS

In the IDS filed on 29 September 2004, Canadian Patent Application 2312275 was listed in the IDS as being a US Patent and, as such, a copy of the Canadian Application was not filed. In order to remedy this, a copy of the Canadian application is herewith being filed in a Supplement IDS.

Specification

The disclosure was objected to because of certain informalities. In response, Applicant has amended the asserted informalities.

Drawings

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR §1.84(p)(4) because reference characters "30" and "100" have been used to designate both a deposit slot/print receipt slot and database/controller.

In response, Applicant has amended the specification to remove the objectionable material. Drawing changes are not required to overcome the objection.

§112 Rejections

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. A full account of the rejection can be found in paragraph 4 of the official action.

In response, Applicant has amended the specification to overcome the rejection. The amendment to the specification is supported by claim 15 as originally filed.

Claim 6 was objected to under 35 USC §112. It was asserted in the official action that there is no antecedent basis for "said status" in line 2.

Application No. 10/772489
Page 7

Amendment
Attorney Docket No. P68.2B-11477-US01

Applicant fails to see the term "said status" in claim 6, however, Applicant does notice that "said device" lacks antecedent basis. As such, claim 6 has been appropriately amended.

§102 Rejections

Claims 1-4, 6, 9-13 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Hughes (US 2004/0210515).

Applicant respectfully submits that Hughes is not prior art to the present application because the present application claims the benefit of Canadian Patent Application 2418663, which was filed on February 7, 2003, which predates the filing date of the Hughes publication. The Canadian Application filing receipt was included in the filing of the present application and identified in Applicant's Application Data Sheet. The foreign priority is also found on Applicant's publication of the present application. To perfect the foreign priority claim, Applicant will be filing a certified copy of the Canadian Application subsequently.

§103 Rejections

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes (US 2004/0210515), as applied to claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection fails because, as mentioned above, Hughes is not prior art to the present application.

Claims 7 and 8 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes (US 2004/0210515), as applied to claim 1, further in view of Monaghan (US 2002/0065775).

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection fails because, as mentioned above, Hughes is not prior art to the present application.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes (US 2004/0210515), as applied to claim 13.

Application No. 10/772489
Page 8

Amendment
Attorney Docket No. P68.2B-11477-US01


Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection fails because, as mentioned above, Hughes is not prior art to the present application.

If the Examiner wishes to discuss further issues, he is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

VIDAS, ARRETT & STEINKRAUS

By:



William E. Anderson II

Registration No.: 37766

Date: April 18, 2005

6109 Blue Circle Drive, Suite 2000
Minnetonka, MN 55343-9185
Telephone: (952) 563-3000
Facsimile: (952) 563-3001

f:\wpwork\wca\11477us01_amd_20050418.doc